

STUDIES IN THE THEACEAE, XVI
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON THE GENUS LAPLACEA

CLARENCE E. KOBUSKI

WHILE WORKING over the genus *Laplacea* in connection with my study of Theaceae I have discovered that by some peculiar oversight the type-species of the genus *Wikstroemia* Schrader has never been officially transferred to *Laplacea*, the accepted name by which Schrader's entity is now known.

As far as the generic name *Laplacea* is concerned, there is no involved synonymy if one abides by the "Rules of Nomenclature," since the name has been adopted as one of the "nomina conservanda." However, before *Laplacea* was placed on the conserved list considerable feeling was expressed by various authors in favor of one or another of the generic names now recognized as synonyms of the genus.

Blake, in *Contrib. Gray Herb.* 53: 39. 1918, made a very detailed study of the situation and maintained that the original name *Wikstroemia* Schrader should be retained for the genus, regardless of the fact that a much larger genus in the Thymelaeaceae possessed the same name and had been placed on the list of conserved names in 1905. At the same time he proposed new combinations for all the then existent species and varieties of Schrader's genus.

However, as Blake pointed out, *Wikstroemia* Schrader was described in 1821, while *Wikstroemia* Endlicher, a genus of the Thymelaeaceae, was introduced much later, in 1833. Also the name *Wikstroemia* Endlicher, borne by a large genus and generally accepted, was long antedated by the name *Capura* Linnaeus which was introduced in 1771. There was good logic in Blake's stand, which, however, went for nought, since the name *Wikstroemia* had already been adopted and conserved for the larger genus in the Thymelaeaceae. *Laplacea* was eventually conserved for the genus of the Theaceae. It is interesting to note that when the name *Laplacea* finally appeared as the conserved name in *Kew Bull.* 1940: 112. 1940, the synonym or rejected names listed were *Haemocharis* Salisb. and *Lindleya* Nees. *Wikstroemia* Schrad. was not listed. This may be accounted for in part, possibly, by the fact that *Wikstroemia* Endlicher of the Thymelaeaceae had appeared on the conserved list many years earlier. However, there seems to be no reason for the oversight considering the fact that previous publicity had been given Schrader's genus by Blake, Rehder and Sprague, and in all three cases in the interpretation of Rules of Nomenclature.

It was while reviewing Blake's paper and tracing his references, some of

them obscure and difficult to obtain, that I realized that the correct combination for Schrader's original species had never been made.

Because of the obscurity of the publications, I relate below in detail the circumstances concerning the early publications of the names *Wikstroemia fruticosa* Schrader and *Lindleya semiserrata* Nees.

In the short span of 33 days in the year 1821 the real story of the genus was unfolded. On May the fifth, 1821, Schrader, in *Göttingische gelehrten Anzeigen* (No. 72, p. 710), a publication which evidently appeared three times weekly, published the new genus *Wikstroemia*, and on the following page listed a single species *W. fruticosa*, spelled "fructicosa." This new binomial was based on a specimen (no. 15), collected by Prinz Maximilian von Neuwied in Brazil. The generic description was in Latin and as complete as any of the descriptions for members of the Theaceae at that time. There could be no questioning of the date since a date appeared on every leaf of the publication, varying, of course, with the time of publication.

In the same month, at Regensburg, on May the twenty-first, Nees, in volume 4 of *Flora*, known also as *Botanische Zeitung Regensburg* (no. 19, p. 299), published a new genus *Lindleya*, giving no specific name, however. Nees had received a duplicate set of the Brazilian plants collected by Prinz Maximilian von Neuwied. By an odd coincidence Nees based his new genus *Lindleya* on the same Neuwied number which Schrader had cited in his publication of approximately two weeks earlier.

It may be assumed that Nees saw Schrader's publication of May 5, 1821, very shortly after it appeared, for on June 7 Nees (*Flora* vol. 4, p. 328) listed the combination *Lindleya semiserrata*, but merely as a synonym of *Wikstroemia fruticosa*. He mentioned that his own work on the collection was in manuscript form and in the hands of the collector (Neuwied) at the time. He further stated that he would rescind his earlier abstract (presumably that of May 21, 1821), since its publication was antedated by that of Schrader. He wrote also that, since it would be very instructive to see just how he agreed or disagreed with Schrader's treatment, he would offer a bit of amusement for the readers of "Flora" by listing his synonyms along with the original names of Schrader.

There seem to have been approximately fifty numbers in the set of specimens worked over by Schrader. Nees' set was less complete, since he listed twelve numbers as missing from his set. Of the approximate thirty-five numbers which the two workers had in common, Nees offered synonyms for fifteen of Schrader's new species. Of course these synonyms of Nees were all actually new combinations. His manner of listing is as follows: "15. *Wikstroemia fruticosa* Schr. ist *Lindleya semiserrata* n."

Just what feeling existed between the botanists of that time is difficult to ascertain; also the circumstances regarding the publication of the identifications on the Prinz Maximilian von Neuwied collection. At any rate, in the same year, Sprengel, in *Vet. Akad. Handl. Stockholm 1821*: 167. 1821, published a second genus, *Wikstroemia* (Compositae), named after

the same Dr. J. E. Wikström. He ignored Schrader's genus of the same name, failing to mention its existence. A footnote by the editor drew attention to Schrader's earlier *Wikstroemia* but stated that it was understood to be merely a synonym of Nees' *Lindleya*. The exact month of the last-mentioned publication is not certain. However, the complete action involving this confusion in synonymy took place in less than eight months!

In the following year (1822) Humboldt, Bonpland & Kunth (Nov. Gen. Sp. Pl. 5: 207) introduced the genus *Laplacea*, the name now conserved by the "International Rules." The date printed in the front of the volume was 1821, which might have confused the issue even further. However, according to Barnhart in Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 29: 595. 1902, the date of publication has been ascertained as 1822, rather than 1821. The type-species was in no way involved by the creation of the genus *Laplacea*, since H. B. & K. described *L. speciosa* from Peru in their work, not the species under discussion. *Laplacea speciosa* was designated as the type of the genus when the generic name *Laplacea* was conserved.

Four years later (1826), Martius and Zuccarini in Nov. Gen. Sp. 1: 107, t. 66, entered still another name, *Haemocharis*, and used the binomial *H. semiserrata*. *Lindleya* Nees was reported in the synonymy of *Haemocharis*, but not the binomial *L. semiserrata*.

The next year (1827), Cambessedes, in St. Hilaire, Fl. Bras. Mer. 1: 300, accepted *Laplacea* and transferred thereto *Haemocharis semiserrata*, attributing the parenthetical authorship to Martius & Zuccarini. Since that time the species has been recorded under either *Laplacea* or *Haemocharis* with the specific name "semiserrata."

A detailed record of the synonymy of this species follows:

Laplacea fruticosa (Schrader) Kobuski, comb. nov.

Wikstroemia fruticosa Schrader in Götting. Gel. Anzeig. 1821 (71): 711. May 5, 1821; "fruticosa."—Pontin [Editor] in Vet. Akad. Handl. Stockholm 1821: 168. 1821, obs. in footnote.—Blake in Contrib. Gray Herb. 53: 39. 1918.

Lindleya semiserrata Nees in Flora 4(1): 328. June 7, 1821, nom. nud., as syn.

Haemocharis semiserrata (Nees) Martius & Zuccarini, Nov. Gen. Sp. 1: 107, t. 66. 1826.—Choisy in Mém. Soc. Phys. Hist. Nat. Genève 1: 144 (Mém. Ternstr. 56). 1855.—Szyszylowicz in Nat. Pflanzenfam. III. 6: 185, 189. 1893.

Gordonia semiserrata (Nees) Sprengel, Syst. Veg. Cur. Post. 4(2): 260, 408. 1827.

Laplacea semiserrata (Nees) Cambessedes in St. Hilaire, Fl. Bras. Mer. 1: 300. 1827; in Mém. Mus. Genève 16: 407, t. 1, fig. A. 1828.—Spach, Hist. Nat. Veg. 4: 76. 1835.—Hooker in Curtis's Bot. Mag. 70: t. 4129. 1844.—Wawra in Martius, Fl. Bras. 12(1): 289. 1886.—Melchior in Nat. Pflanzenfam. ed. 2, 21: 136. 1925.

Laplacea inaequilatera Schott in Sprengel, Syst. Veg. Cur. Post. 4(2): App. 408. 1827.

Laplacea praemorsa Splitgerber in Hoven & De Vries, Tijdschr. 9: 100. 1842; iter. ex Mohl, Bot. Zeit. 1: 95. 1843.

Laplacea camellioides Sonder in Linnaea 22: 549. 1849.

Haemocharis camellioides (Sonder) Kuntze, Rev. Gen. Pl. 1: 62. 1891.

Haemocharis praemorsa (Splitgerber) Kuntze, Rev. Gen. Pl. 1: 62. 1891.

Laplacea inaequalilatera Hooker & Jackson, Index Kew. 2: 30. 1894, sphalm.

Lindleya fruticosa Hooker & Jackson, Index Kew. 2: 89. 1894, lapsu.

This species is probably the largest and most widespread in all the

genus. To date it has been recorded from Brazil, the Guianas, Colombia, Venezuela, Peru and Bolivia in South America, Panama and even up into Mexico. Of the last I am doubtful.

Also several varieties have been described under *Laplacea semiserrata*. Eventually a more detailed study will show whether these varieties are worthy of recognition. The brief study made so far causes the author to be skeptical of the true varietal lines, and with this in mind he is unwilling to make further new combinations until these entities are studied in relationship with the other described species of the genus.

ARNOLD ARBORETUM,
HARVARD UNIVERSITY.